Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/743,856	ESPINOZA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jafar Parsa	1621
All Participants:	Status of Application: pending	
(1) <u>Jafar Parsa</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Beatrice Ortego</u> .	. (4)	•
Date of Interview: 28 November 2005	Time:	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	olicant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:  Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpater (USPN 6,130,184).	ntable over Plecha et al (USPN 6	i,124,367) in view of Geerling et al
Claims discussed: 1 and 17		
Prior art documents discussed: US 6,124,367		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GEI See Continuation Sheet	NERAL NATURE OF WHAT	WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separal directly resulted in the allowance of the application. of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separal did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief sumn</li> </ul>	The examiner will provide a value te record of the substance of	written summary of the substance
,	·	
Apr Dans	·	
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Application	ant/Applicant's Representativ	e Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner proposed to narrow the range of cobalt content in the catalyst by increasing the lower limit of the cobalt from 40% to 48.8%. US patent 6,124,367 the working examples are limited to 12 wt. % cobalt in the catalyst. Furthermore, the Examiner inadvertantly rejected claims 1-67 over Plecha et al in view of Geerling et al. The actual claims that were rejected are: claims 1-6, 17 and 43-60 and 67, which are directed to the subject matter of Group III.